## Case 1:12-cr-00045-RJS Document 460 Filed 07/24/15 Page 1 of 2

UNITED	STATES	DISTRIC	CT CO	URT
SOUTHE	RN DIST	TRICT OF	NEW	YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

-V-

JERMAINE DORE,

Defendant.

USDS :	SDNY	The second secon
DOCU	MENT	
ELECT	RONIC	ALLY FILED
DOC#:		
DATE 1	FILED:	7/24/2015

No. 12-cr-45 (RJS) ORDER

## RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of letters dated July 6, 2015 (Doc. No. 458) and July 15, 2015 (Doc. No. 459), and received in chambers on July 20, 2015, from Defendant Jermaine Dore, proceeding *pro se*, requesting that the Court provide him with transcripts from his criminal case and extend the time to file his contemplated motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. This is not the first time that Defendant has requested that the Court provide copies of transcripts from his prior trial. (*See* Doc. Nos. 454, 456.)

For the reasons stated in the Court's prior order at document number 457, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendant's request to obtain transcript documents is DENIED without prejudice to renewal. The Court reiterates that Plaintiff may (1) consult the documentation, including transcripts, provided to him by his prior attorney (*see* Doc. No. 453), (2) obtain new copies of transcripts from the Court's Records Management Office for a fee, or (3) petition the Court to provide him with transcripts free of charge following the submission of his contemplated motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 "if the trial judge . . . certifies that the suit . . . is not frivolous and that the transcript is needed to decide the issue presented by the suit . . . ," *see* 28 U.S.C. § 753(f).

Case 1:12-cr-00045-RJS Document 460 Filed 07/24/15 Page 2 of 2

In light of the fact that Defendant may supplement his contemplated 28 U.S.C. § 2255

motion with reference to any trial transcripts the Court may supply to him, IT IS HEREBY

ORDERED THAT Defendant's request for an extension of time within which to file a § 2255

motion is DENIED.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order

would not be taken in good faith, and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose

of an appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

July 24, 2015

New York, New York

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE